

Remarks

Applicant thanks the Examiner for considering the references listed on the Information Disclosure Statement filed on November 13, 2002. Further, Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating that the drawings filed on February 5, 2002 have been accepted by the USPTO.

Claims 1-28 are pending in the Application. Claims 1, 14, 26-28 are independent claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for allowing claim 26 and for noting the potential allowability of claims 8 and 21 if these claims are rewritten to include the limitations of their respective base claims.

As noted above, Applicant has amended independent claims 8 and 21 to include the limitations of their respective base claims, claims 1 and 14, without prejudice or disclaimer. Moreover, claims 1 and 14 have been cancelled.

In addition, the dependency of claims 2-4, 6, 7, 9, 12 and 13 has been changed to claim 8. Similarly, the dependency of claims 15-17, 19, 20, 22 and 25 has been changed to claim 21. Further, claims 27 and 28 have been amended to recite the limitations of calculating the number of formatting elements needed to display the requested content and determining if the calculated number of formatting elements exceeds a predetermined threshold. As a result, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2-13 and 15-28 are now in allowable form.

Objections to Claims:

The Examiner has objected to claims 8, 9, 21 and 26 due to certain informalities. Applicant has amended claims 8, 9 and 26 as noted above, and as suggested by the Examiner, to address these objections. Further, in claim 21, Applicant submits that the terms "calculating" and determining do not refer to separate elements given that the claim is directed to an apparatus. As such, Applicant has not amended claim 21.

Rejections:

Claim 28 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 28 as suggested by the Examiner to address this rejection.

Claims 1-7 and 9-13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lemay, Sams Teach Yourself Web Publishing with HTML 4 in 21 days (Sams Pub., 2000). Moreover, claims 14, 15, 17-20, 22-24 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ewita.¹ In addition, claims 16 and 27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Ewita and Official Notice. Finally, claim 25 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious in view of Ewita and Lemay.

As noted above, Applicant has rewritten claims 8 and 21 in independent form, cancelled claims 1 and 14 and changed the dependency of the remaining dependant claims to claim 8 or 21, as necessary. In addition claims 27 and 28 have been amended to recite calculating and comparing the number of formatting elements to track the language of claim 26. The above rejections are, therefore, moot. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the above rejections and submits that the invention as presently claimed in claims 2-13 and 15-28 is patentable and in condition for allowance.

Authorization:

No fee is believed due with this Amendment other than that associated with the enclosed petition for extension of time to respond. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or

¹ www.ewita.com/EWITA%20tools/ptrv/menu/frameset.html (Nov. 7, 1999).

credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit
Account Number 16-1885.

Conclusion:

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-13 and 15-28 of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3852.

Respectfully submitted,



Eric P. Halber
Reg. No. 46,378
Attorney of Record
Telephone (203) 924-3852

PITNEY BOWES INC.
Intellectual Property and
Technology Law Department
35 Waterview Drive
P.O. Box 3000
Shelton, CT 06484-8000